DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 398 187 SP 036 796

TITLE	Educator Professional Development: A Key Element in States' Education Reform Efforts.
INSTITUTION	Texas State Legislative Budget Board, Austin.
PUB DATE	Nov 94
NOTE	57p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Legislative Budget Board, P. O. Box 12666, Austin, TX 78711.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Education; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Preservice Teacher Education; *Principals; State Programs; Statewide Planning; *Teacher Improvement; Teacher Promotion
IDENTIFIERS	Reform Efforts; *Texas

ABSTRACT

This study examined Texas school district spending on staff development and analyzes characteristics of district staff development programs. The study reviewed two statewide programs that provide extended staff development opportunities to participating schools to see if gains in student learning could be documented. The report also looked at both preservice and inservice development of principals and teachers and assessed higher education's role in the preparation and development of educators. Sections of the report cover: (1) school district spending on staff development; (2) training and development for principals; (3) training and development for teachers; (4) linking staff development to improved student learning; and (5) higher education's role in the preparation and development of educators. Based on the findings, recommendations are made regarding preparation, development, and certification of principals and teachers as well as rewriting promotion, tenure, and rewards policies to recognize university faculty for working with public school educators. A list of the participating school districts and the survey instrument are appended. (Contains 24 references.) (ND)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 398 187

SP

EDUCATOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: A KEY ELEMENT IN STATES' EDUCATION REFORM EFFORTS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P Dunn

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Prepared By: **Legislative Budget Board Staff in cooperation with the Educational Economic Policy Center**

Presented To: **Legislative Budget Board Educational Economic Policy Committee**

November 1994

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

This report was prepared by Legislative Budget Board staff
with the cooperation of the Educational Economic Policy Center
for presentation to the Legislative Budget Board and the
Educational Economic Policy Committee.

Nancy Frank, Senior Analyst
Ana Munoz, Programmer Analyst
Public Education Team

You may obtain additional copies at:
(512) 463-1200
FAX (512) 475-2903

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary and Conclusions	i
Recommendations	iv
Introduction	1
School District Spending on Staff Development	4
Training and Development for Principals	8
Preparation and Initial Certification	8
Continuing Certification and Development Requirements	11
State Board of Education and Texas Education Agency Improvement Efforts	11
National Improvement Efforts	11
Support for Reform in Texas	14
Improvement Initiatives in Other States	15
Training and Development for Teachers	18
Preparation and Initial Certification	18
Continuing Certification and Development Requirements	19
State Board of Education and Texas Education Agency Improvement Efforts	20
National Improvement Efforts	22
Improvement Initiatives in Other States	25
Linking Staff Development to Improved Student Learning	26
Higher Education's Role in the Preparation & Development of Educators	29
Conclusions	31

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Staff development is being hailed by most educators nationwide as the key ingredient in the recipe to improve our nation's schools. The theory is that many of the current cadre of teachers are inadequately prepared to teach today's students--a large number who are from culturally diverse backgrounds, live in poverty, and have a myriad of learning styles. Also, not all teachers are academically prepared to teach the rigorous public school curriculum that is necessary to adequately prepare students to meet the demands of 21st century jobs. The theory continues that the existing educator workforce must be retrained, and the initial preparation of teachers and administrators upgraded dramatically to allow public education to respond to demands from taxpayers and others for improvements in student academic skills.

More inservice training or staff development for practicing educators is being promoted at the federal, state and local levels. Most states are discussing or implementing reform packages aimed at restructuring educator preparation programs, establishing standards that outline what teachers and administrators need to know in order to be successful practitioners, and designing assessment systems to measure whether teachers and administrators meet the standards to be certified or licensed to practice.

There is general agreement that educator training programs at our colleges and universities have not kept pace with the changes in our public schools. Surveys of practicing teachers and administrators point out that preparation programs are marginal, at best. What is less certain, however, is whether training and development efforts with the current cadre of educators will lead to improved student performance. There is limited research-based evidence that links staff development with improved student learning. However, the initial results from the Texas Partnership Schools Initiative that show greater improvement on the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) tests at certain grade levels for partnership students compared to students statewide are encouraging. Further evaluation is needed to determine whether the improvement can be attributed to the staff development activities and additional training days granted these schools.

Commissioner of Education Lionel Meno has recommended that the state provide funding for up to 20 additional days of staff development each year. The Texas Education Agency estimates that adding five staff development days in 1996 and another five in 1997 will cost almost $1 billion.

Staff development must be linked to the specific needs of the educator in order to be effective. Texas does not have in place adequate evaluation or assessment processes to diagnose the skill development needs of teachers and school leaders. This fact, coupled with reports from teachers that current inservice training isn't relevant to their classroom teaching, calls into question the wisdom of mandating more staff development days at this time.

The Commissioner recommends that districts be allowed to substitute up to 15 days of student instructional days for staff development training if funding is not provided for additional staff development days. Existing law gives the Commissioner the authority to waive state laws, including the number of instructional days. He has approved over 2,000 requests from schools and school districts over the last three years to use instructional days for staff development.

The positive side of the waiver process is that schools and districts must submit brief documentation to explain the purpose of the staff development and show evidence that teachers have been involved in the planning of the activities. Since teachers cite a lack of teacher input into the staff development planning process as another flaw of current inservice programs, the waiver requirements force applying districts to include the intended beneficiaries of the staff training--the teachers--in the identification and development of the programs. This waiver process should continue until assessment systems are in place to identify the skill development needs of educators.

Texas has kept pace with other states in most areas in its efforts to develop a comprehensive educator professional development system--beginning with the initial preparation of teachers and administrators. Texas educators are required to pass tests that assess subject matter knowledge and pedagogical skills to be certified. The State Board of Education has adopted proficiencies, or standards, for teachers and administrators. The Board will be contracting this fall for the development of a teacher appraisal system that will measure teacher attainment of those desired proficiencies. The system will replace the current Texas Teacher Appraisal System and include multiple performance assessment activities, such as interviews, teacher classroom performance and student work. The Board also will begin holding colleges and universities accountable for the performance of graduates of educator training programs. Only those programs whose graduates pass the certification tests and perform in the classroom will be accredited. In addition, the Commissioner has recommended that a separate educator standards board be created to advise the State Board on educator preparation and certification. The select committee reviewing the Texas Education Agency and the State Board of Education has recommended that a quasi-independent State Board for Educator Certification be established. The State Board for Educator Certification would have authority over educator training and certification and disciplinary actions involving practitioners. The

State Board of Education would retain authority to approve or reject decisions of the certification board.

Yet, with all these initiatives, there are "holes" in the system that need to be plugged before Texas has a truly comprehensive program of educator preparation and development.

The first "hole" is that principals--key figures in any efforts to make schools successful--have received little attention in the State Board's efforts to upgrade educator preparation and development. There are no preparation or certification requirements specifically designed for principals. Principals must have a mid-management certificate, but that certificate generally qualifies a person for any administrative position in a school district except the superintendent's job. Principals are lumped together with all other administrators in the State Board's identification of proficiencies for administrators. The state has no plans to develop a principal (or administrator) appraisal system and mid-management preparation programs will be judged solely on the performance of graduates on the mid-management Examination for the Certification of Educators in Texas (ExCET) test.

Another problem that remains unaddressed is that Texas teachers and administrators are certified for life once initial requirements have been met. Texas is one of only nine states to issue lifetime certificates. Certainly, the state does not want to create a regulatory nightmare by renewing certificates too often or being overly prescriptive with its renewal requirements. Yet it seems logical to expect educators to demonstrate, particularly in the beginning years of a career, that they can effectively contribute to student learning.

While the State Board of Education is in the process of contracting for the development of a more effective teacher appraisal process, the system will not come on-line until the 1997-1998 school year--three years from now. Instead of losing time and spending a great deal of development money, the state should look at an existing assessment system--Educational Testing Service's *Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments*--to see if it meets the state's needs. Educational Testing Service already has spent millions of dollars developing and validating the system.

It should become common practice for the state to look at existing products and work done in other states and nationally to see if they can be adapted for use in Texas before initiating lengthy, and often costly, development efforts. The teacher appraisal system is just one example. Another is the State Board of Education's process for developing the teacher and administrator proficiencies. These are generic proficiencies and are not tied to any specific subject or curriculum being taught. It took from summer of 1992 to spring of 1994 to produce and adopt the proficiencies. Before and during that time, several national groups--the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, Interstate New

Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, Educational Testing Service, and others--published model standards for teachers that are not much different than what Texas adopted. As early as 1990, the National Commission for the Principalship, the planning body for the National Policy Board for Educational Administration, had identified the knowledge and skills that principals must possess to become effective school leaders.

Study Overview

This study examines school district spending on staff development for the past three years and analyzes characteristics of district staff development programs. The report also looks at both preservice and inservice development of principals and teachers. The study reviews two statewide programs--the Partnership Schools Initiative and the Middle School Network--that provide extended staff development opportunities to participating schools to see if gains in student learning can be documented. Finally, the report assesses higher education's role in the preparation and development of educators.

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are offered as next-steps in the process and modifications to the initiatives the State Board of Education, the Commissioner and the Texas Education Agency have undertaken to restructure the state's professional development system.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Principal Preparation and Development

- A principal certificate should be established and standards, or proficiencies, adopted for principals based on the essential skills and knowledge identified by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration.

- In addition to passing the ExCET test, principal candidates should be required to successfully complete the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) Assessment Center process to be certified as a principal. The initial certificate would be valid for three to five years. Universities and alternative programs could use the Assessment Center program to evaluate entering principal candidates and at the beginning of the preparation process to map out individualized education and training plans.

- University and alternative principal preparation programs should be accredited based on the percentage of graduates who become certified.

- During the period of initial certification, principals should be paired with mentors.

- Renewal of the initial certificate should be based on local evaluations, the overall performance or demonstrated improvement of performance of students in that principal's school, and mentor recommendations.

- The state should develop an advanced certificate or endorsement for experienced principals. Interested principals would voluntarily seek this certificate or endorsement. The assessment process would be highly rigorous and identify only those principals that are true "masters" in their profession. Principals with an advanced certificate or endorsement could be used as mentors for beginning principals.

- Currently certified principals should be required to participate in the NASSP Assessment Center, or NASSP's one-day Leadership Early Assessment Program. These activities provide practicing principals with professional development suggestions on building the necessary skills to be an effective educational leader. The assessment of currently-certified principals should be phased-in over three years, beginning in 1995-1996.

- The state should establish regionally-located assessment centers that are accredited by NASSP in the Assessment Center process. These centers could be located at Regional Education Service Centers, universities or local school districts. These centers would conduct initial principal assessments, provide principals with individualized professional growth plans based on assessment results, and do follow-up assessments after principals complete training and development activities to verify proficiency in all skill areas.

- Of the $20 million annual state appropriation for professional staff development, $3 million should be targeted for training programs designed to address the skill deficiencies of principals identified during the assessment process. These funds could be allocated on an application basis to Centers for Professional Development and Technology, universities, Regional Education Service Centers, school districts, or any other entity that can provide quality principal development programs. A portion of these funds also should cover the costs of assessment centers and training for assessors.

Teacher Preparation and Development

- The state should examine using Educational Testing Service's *Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments* as an element of the teacher appraisal process. The appraisal process also should evaluate teacher performance based on the overall performance or improvement of performance of students in that teacher's classroom.

- Universities and alternative teacher preparation programs should adopt a teacher warranty policy. Any teacher who performs poorly, as measured by the state's teacher appraisal process, would be eligible to receive additional training and assistance from the institution that trained the teacher provided the teacher completed the program within the last five years.

- The state should adopt a recertification system that requires teachers to periodically renew teaching certificates. Renewal of the initial certificate should be based on the state teacher appraisal and performance results.

- As the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards' voluntary advanced certification process develops, Texas should look at ways to recognize and encourage teacher participation in National Board certification.

Other Recommendations

- The Commissioner should continue to require school districts and schools to request waivers to substitute instructional days for staff development days. Up to 15 days could be used for staff development. The campus site-based decision making committee should play a key role in planning staff development activities.

- Boards of Regents and Presidents of higher education institutions should review promotion, tenure and reward policies to recognize university faculty for working with public school educators to prepare teachers and administrators, provide on-going educator development, and collaborate on special projects.

EDUCATOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT: A KEY ELEMENT IN STATES' EDUCATION REFORM EFFORTS

INTRODUCTION

One can hardly pick up an education journal or newsletter without hearing such pronouncements as "professional development has become a linchpin of the movement for national education standards" (Education Week, May 18, 1994, p. 8) or "an essential dimension in responding to these new demands [higher standards] is high-quality, career-long professional development" (OERI Bulletin, Winter, 1994, p. 1).

The Texas Commissioner of Education, Lionel Meno, has proposed that 20 days of staff development be added to the three days of inservice for teachers required each school year. In 1992, the Education Commission of the States reported that most states provide for far fewer teacher inservice training and staff development days than Commissioner Meno proposes. The only state to come close is Florida with 16. North Carolina allows from 7 to 15 days. Four other states--Alaska, Georgia, South Carolina, Virginia--allot 10 days for teacher staff development.

What is staff development? What kinds of activities are included under the umbrella of staff development?

In a report published by the National Staff Development Council, "[s]taff development is defined as those processes that improve the job-related knowledge, skills, or attitudes of school employees." (Sparks, Loucks-Horsley, 1990, p. 5) The report identifies a variety of staff development activities, in addition to traditional skills training programs, that include teacher study groups, individual research and professional networking. The authors also review the research on staff development and its link to improved student learning. Of interest are their findings that skills training is the only staff development activity that has been researched in-depth and studies show can have an impact on student achievement. They report that training programs, with appropriate follow-up and coaching, have the potential to change the perspective and instructional methods of teachers so as to positively impact student performance.

A U.S. Department of Education report, however, urges policymakers to use caution in viewing staff development as the quick-fix for our public schools. While analyzing the research on educational reform, the authors conclude that most current staff development activities in schools have little impact on improving student learning. They argue that unless staff development is part of overall systemic reform--state-, district-, and school-

wide restructuring--then any improvement in teaching and learning that is linked to staff development will be short-lived. (Saskin, Egermeir, 1993)

The good news for Texas lawmakers is that the elements of public education systems restructuring Saskin and Egermeir argue for--decentralizing authority and holding schools accountable--are being implemented in our state. School districts have a mandate to practice site-based decision making. Districts began shifting authority from central office to campuses in the 1992-1993 school year. Yet a recent study by the Texas Center for Educational Research reports that only 20 percent of districts have moved to true site-managed systems. (Praskac, Powell, 1993)

A new state accountability structure was established during the 1993 legislative session. That system sets forth state standards, requires the curriculum to be aligned to fit the standards, and calls for frequent assessment of students to see if the standards are met.

Saskin and Egermeir argue that it is in the context of this restructured system that schools must learn to function. And, that staff development can play an important role in training campus educators to assume decision-making roles and to alter curriculum and instruction to become comprehensive, integrated and more student focused.

In Texas, the Legislature has mandated that staff development be primarily school-based and planned cooperatively with campus site-based decision making committees. Texas Education Code, 16.052(e), additionally, outlines possible staff development activities.

> ...Campus staff development activities may include activities that enable the campus staff to plan together, to enhance existing skills, to share effective strategies, to reflect on curricular and instructional issues, to analyze student achievement results, to reflect on means of increasing student achievement, to study research, to practice new methods, to identify students' strengths and needs, to develop meaningful programs for students, to appropriately implement site-based decision making, and to conduct action research. Staff development activities may include study teams, individual research, peer coaching, workshops, seminars, conferences, and other reasonable activities that have the potential to improve student achievement.

As noted earlier, Texas requires school districts to provide for at least three days of staff development training. However, many districts and schools have received waivers from the Commissioner of Education to provide additional days of staff development in lieu of instructional days. During Commissioner Meno's term of office, educator professional development has been a top priority. Shortly after becoming Commissioner, Meno launched the Partnership Schools Initiative which provides up to an additional 15 days of

staff development for the 98 participating schools. The Commissioner was granted legal authority in 1990 to waive many state laws, including the number of instructional days. Requests from schools and districts for more staff development days and fewer instructional days are approved routinely. From September, 1991 until March, 1994, 2,070 of the 5,203 waivers approved gave schools and districts additional staff training days.

SCHOOL DISTRICT SPENDING ON STAFF DEVELOPMENT

The Education Commission of the States explored the school reform efforts of twenty school districts in six states to examine the shifts in spending as a result of reform activities. Eighty percent of the districts interviewed reported higher spending on staff development to support local reform efforts. The districts emphasized staff training in the areas of curriculum development, assessment strategies, team building, and planning and budgeting. While the activities were viewed as critical to the reform efforts, staff development spending as a percent of the districts' overall budgets was less than 5 percent in all cases, and most were less than 1 percent. (Education Commission of the States, 1992)

In an effort to analyze spending on staff development in Texas public schools, 91 school districts were sent surveys during spring of 1994. The districts were chosen randomly from groups of districts of varying sizes. Sixty-nine districts responded to the survey although not all districts were able to provide information at the level of detail requested. (See Attachment 1, School Districts Participating in Staff Development Survey) These districts contain 1.4 million students, or almost 40 percent of the statewide total enrollment. Given this, and the random nature of selection process, the survey results can be expected to reflect, generally, what is happening in Texas school districts.

While information is available through the Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) on curriculum and instructional staff development, there was concern about the narrow focus of the PEIMS definition. For purposes of this study, the definition was expanded to include spending on principals, in addition to teachers and other instructional personnel. Also, other staff development activities and salary costs were identified to be included. (See Attachment 2, Survey of School District Staff Development Programs)

Districts in the survey were asked to report staff development expenditures for fiscal years 1991, 1992 and 1993. By calculating a per student expenditure amount within the sample and applying that to students statewide, school districts in Texas spent an estimated **$108.5 million** in 1993 on staff development for principals, teachers and other instructional personnel. Staff development spending for 1992 was an estimated **$85 million**, with expenditures in 1991 estimated to have been only slightly lower at **$84 million**.

School districts in the survey were asked to include in the reported expenditures any amounts paid to Regional Education Service Centers (RESCs) for inservice and staff development. However, school districts generally don't pay beyond their RESC membership fees for staff development programs provided by service centers. For 1994, RESCs budgeted **$52.7 million** on training and professional development. Fiscal year

1994 is the first year RESC's will report staff development expenditures.

Forty-nine of the respondents were able to separate spending on staff development for principals, teachers and other instructional personnel from total expenditures. Based on those districts, 83.5 percent of total spending for staff development for 1993 was for teachers, 7.9 for principals and 8.6 percent for other instructional personnel.

Districts also were asked to report staff development expenditures by two sources of funds--state/local funds and federal funds. Sixty-three districts accounted for spending by these fund sources. Slightly over 75% of total spending in 1993 came from state/local funds. The remaining 25% was paid for with federal funds.

Forty-four districts were able to provide staff development expenditure data for each campus in the district. In 1993, those districts allocated 31 percent of staff development money to elementary campuses, 35 percent to middle schools, and 34 percent to high schools. That is a more even distribution of funds among types of schools than in previous years. For 1992, elementary schools received 27 percent of staff development funds, middle schools 39 percent, and high schools received 34 percent. The breakdown in 1991 was 28 percent for elementary schools, and 36 percent each for middle schools and high schools.

Per student spending on staff development by districts in the survey was analyzed by wealth and size of district to see if any distinct spending patterns emerged. Additionally, spending was analyzed based on the percentage of students in the district passing all Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) tests. It appears there is no relationship between the wealth of the school district or performance of students on TAAS tests, and the amount of money spent on staff development. What does seem to influence spending on staff development is the size of the district. Spending in districts with over 50,000 students was substantially higher than in districts in other size categories.

Number of Districts	Size Category	Spending Per Student
6	Over 50,000	45.51
15	25,000 to 49,999	15.24
9	10,000 to 24,999	26.84
6	5,000 to 9,999	18.50
8	3,000 to 4,999	24.78
7	1,600 to 2,999	24.46
4	1,000 to 1,599	12.79
7	500 to 999	30.93
7	Under 500	18.17

In addition to supplying expenditure data, districts responded to a series of questions that provide a description of how districts operate local staff development programs. Districts were allowed to choose more than one response to each question. "Other" responses had no significant impact on any individual question and were discarded for this analysis.

- Districts were asked what mechanism they use to determine how much to spend each year on staff development. Fifty-one percent of districts responded that district staff development spending is based on requests from campuses. Staff development spending is determined by personnel or program deficiencies identified by central administration in 41 percent of the districts. Only 8 percent fund staff development as a percent of the district's total budget.

- Eighty-four percent of districts responded that they allocate staff development funds to campuses in the district. Of those districts, 33 percent base the allocation on the schools' requests. The remaining 67 percent use a variety of methods such as a per pupil or per staff allocation to campuses. The largest school districts--those with more than 50,000 students--tend to allocate more money to low-performing schools.

- Districts report that campus-level committees have the strongest voice in deciding how much and how campus staff development funds are spent, and are primarily responsible for selecting providers of staff training. These findings are perplexing when compared with the results of another study that showed that only 32 percent of Texas teachers surveyed felt that they were involved in developing and evaluating teacher inservice programs. (See page 20)

- Who or what entity provides staff training most often depends on the size of the school district. The larger districts--those with more than 10,000 students--tend to rely on district staff and master teachers within the district to deliver staff training. For small districts, a greater percentage of the training is delivered by RESCs.

- Districts were asked how they evaluate the effectiveness of their staff development programs. Forty-five percent responded that programs are judged by their impact on improving student performance. Forty-two percent evaluate staff development programs by surveying participants for "customer" satisfaction.

- Districts were asked several questions regarding staff development programs for principals. Thirty-seven percent report that the superintendent decides how much the district spends on principal staff development but the training activities are chosen most often by the principals. The survey indicates that the districts spend the most time developing principals in the areas of instruction and curriculum design and leadership skills.

- In responding to the questions focused on staff development for teachers and instructional personnel only, once again the districts report that the campus-level committees decide most often how much and how to spend staff development dollars. Almost all of the districts--91 percent--require teachers to attend districtwide training activities. Teachers spend the greatest amount of time in training programs on instructional strategies, curriculum design, and the use of technology.

TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT FOR PRINCIPALS

The importance of having well-trained and highly-skilled principals in our public schools cannot be over emphasized. Numerous research studies point to the principal as a key factor in determining the success or failure of a school.

Two decades of effective schools research has identified the characteristics of schools in which children learn. Strong leadership on the part of the principal leads the list and *influences* the other elements of effective schools, clear school goals, a safe, secure learning environment and high teacher expectations for student success.

The National Commission for the Principalship points out that every educational reform study in the 1980's emphasized that only strong school leaders can produce excellent schools.

> If the bottom line for schools is student learning and attitude building as measurable outcomes, principals can make a difference. A growing body of evidence suggests that principals influence the quality of student outcomes by developing with staff a school mission that focuses upon instruction. The principal also influences the school's instructional climate by the quality of interaction with teachers and students, and shapes the culture for learning by building norms and initiating organizational procedures that attend to teaching and learning. Principals who possess the knowledge, skills, and values to frame school cultures with an instructional focus become a significant mediating variable for improving instructional outcomes. They affect the instructional climate, which in turn provides an environment that stimulates student learning. (National Commission for the Principalship, 1990, p. 27)

Given the pivotal role principals play in shaping our schools, Texas has paid little attention to upgrading the preservice program and certification requirements for principals. The fact that the state continues to issue a mid-management certificate that covers principals and a number of other administrative positions instead of focusing on certifying *school principals* as over half of the other states do is cause for concern. (National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, 1994-1995)

PREPARATION AND INITIAL CERTIFICATION

Preparation

State law requires the State Board of Education to accredit educator preparation programs.

Thirty-seven universities in Texas offer programs leading to certification as a mid-management administrator. The State Board also has approved alternative mid-management certification programs in the Houston Independent School District and at the Region 13 (Austin) Education Service Center.

A university-based mid-management preparation program includes an administrative internship experience, 15 to 18 semester hours of courses to develop general administrative competencies, 9 to 12 semester hours in academic areas of study, such as anthropology and sociology, and 15 to 18 semester hours in specialized administrator preparation courses.

Rules for approval of alternative certification programs for administrators require that programs be developed collaboratively by school districts, universities and Education Service Centers. Requirements for entry into an alternative program are a college grade point average of 3.0 and from three to five years experience in a position with leadership responsibilities. The program also must include an internship. Intern administrators must, in addition to completing the program, participate in the Texas Education Agency Instructional Leadership Training, the Texas Teacher Appraisal System training program, and perform successfully on the local school district administrator appraisal system.

The Region 13 Education Service Center has developed a comprehensive alternative principal preparation and certification program that differs greatly from the traditional university-based preservice program. The first class of program participants was chosen this spring. The knowledge and skills required for principals outlined by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration provides the framework for the content of the program. Candidates participate in a two-year internship as an assistant principal while in the program and are supported by a mentor principal. Prior to being selected into the program candidates are screened by looking at an applicant's grade point average, writing samples, accomplishment record, and participating in simulation exercises and a panel interview.

Once an applicant is selected, the intern goes through an evaluation process that includes participating in the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) Assessment Center program to develop an individual education plan for the intern. At the end of the two-year period, an intern will have completed over 500 clock hours of training. Since the principal candidate is employed as a full-time intern, training classes and seminars take place in the evenings, weekends and during the summer.

Interns must demonstrate mastery of the performance standards developed by the National Policy Board for each of the 21 skill domains to be recommended for certification. Mastery will be documented through a variety of methods, including mentor reports,

school district job appraisals, and passing the Examination for the Certification of Educators in Texas (ExCET) test for mid-management administrators. In addition, interns must receive successful ratings on post-program NASSP Assessment Center exercises.

How do practicing principals view their preservice programs? In a 1990 survey of four hundred Texas principals (82.1 percent response rate), principals indicated that their university preparation programs were "moderately" successful at developing the skills they needed to perform their jobs. The principals identified "lecture and discussion" as the most frequently used method of instruction even though respondents overwhelmingly preferred the "internship" as the method of acquiring essential knowledge and skills. The principals believed that preparation programs could be improved by expanding instruction of job-related skills, upgrading and extending internships, and using practicing principals to teach courses. (Witters-Churchill, 1990)

Principal focus groups, convened by the Texas A & M University Principals' Center and Region 13 Education Service Center, provided similar responses about their preservice training Most principals indicated that their preparation programs could have been stronger with more emphasis on specific skills training, expanded field experiences, and more teaching by practicing, exemplary principals. When asked what knowledge and skills are needed to be an effective principal, responses included leadership skills, interpersonal communication skills, the skill of delegation, curriculum and instruction skills, assessment, analysis and decision-making skills. (Erlandson, 1994)

Certification

Texas law requires that qualifications for certification as a principal emphasize instructional leadership; administration, supervision, and communication skills; curriculum and instruction management; performance evaluation; organization; and fiscal management.

State Board of Education rules specify that an applicant for a mid-management administrator certificate must have a teaching certificate, a master's degree, a minimum of two years of classroom teaching experience and completed a 45 semester-hour preparation program. Applicants are also required to pass the ExCET test for mid-management administrators to be certified.

Temporary administrator certificates are available for assistant principals and principals. These certificates are valid for five years and are nonrenewable.

CONTINUING CERTIFICATION AND DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS

A study conducted at Iowa State University that examined certification and professional development requirements across the fifty states found that Texas is one of only nine states that *does not require* principals to periodically renew their certificates. In Texas, once an individual meets mid-management certificate requirements, they are certified for life. (Silhanek, 1991)

Certificate renewal for principals in most states involves the accumulation of additional hours of university courses or state-approved staff development programs. However, some states look at a principal's job performance as a part of the certificate renewal process. (National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, 1994-1995)

Florida, for example, has three principal certificates--Level 1 Educational Leadership, Level 2 School Principal, and Level 3 Professional School Principal. Each certificate is valid for five years. While renewal requirements involve hours of appropriate college credit or approved staff development programs, movement to a higher certificate level entails demonstrating positive performance results through the Florida comprehensive performance appraisal and performance management system.

In **New Mexico**, an administrative license is valid for nine years. Continuing licensure is based on results of a comprehensive staff evaluation process and recommendation from the employing superintendent.

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY IMPROVEMENT EFFORTS

Recent efforts by the State Board of Education to restructure the public education professional development system have led to the adoption of performance based proficiencies for administrators. These proficiencies represent the identifiable behaviors all prospective administrators must possess in order to be certified in Texas. While it is difficult to argue with any of the proficiencies, such as "[t]hrough inspiring leadership, the administrator maximizes learning for all students while maintaining professional ethics and personal integrity," they are so broad and non-specific that it makes it difficult to measure whether administrator candidates possess those skills. (Texas Education Agency, 1994, p.11)

NATIONAL IMPROVEMENT EFFORTS

An impressive body of work was produced in 1993 by the National Policy Board for

Educational Administration identifying the skills and knowledge base for effective principals. The Policy Board is sponsored by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, Association of School Business Officials, Council of Chief State School Officers, National Association of Secondary School Principals, National School Boards Association, American Association of School Administrators, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, National Association of Elementary School Principals, National Council of Professors of Educational Administration, and the University Council for Educational Administration.

The Policy Board spent three years working with experts around the country to define the knowledge and skills that principals must have to be school leaders. The skills and knowledge base is organized into 21 categories, or "domains." (See table on next page) Within each domain, the Board has identified performance standards, education and training for developing the knowledge and skills, skill building exercises, and methods for measuring skill attainment.

In its report, the Policy Board points out that principal preparation programs in our colleges and universities "reflect a shopworn theoretical base and fail to recognize changing job requirements. These programs need a serious overhaul." These programs fail because there is no bridge between concepts and practice--the demonstration of knowledge and skills in everyday work situations. These demonstrations can take place through a variety of activities, such as simulations, case studies and field experiences. Unfortunately, the structure of administrator preparation programs has changed very little over the past several decades. (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 1993)

As was noted earlier, the Region 13 Education Service Center alternative principal certification program uses the NASSP Assessment Center to chart a participants education and training program, and, at the end of the program, to measure skill proficiency.

The NASSP Assessment Center was developed in 1975 to provide personnel placement information to employing schools districts and diagnostic information to principal candidates and universities, and practicing principals on staff development needs. The Assessment Center measures generic skills that have been identified as critical for success in the principalship. These skills--problem analysis, judgement, organizational ability, decisiveness, leadership, sensitivity, stress tolerance, oral communication, written communication, range of interests, personal motivation, educational values--are measured through a series of simulations, personal interviews, and fact-finding exercises. These school-related exercises are conducted over two days. Each candidate is observed by NASSP-trained assessors who are generally outstanding practicing principals.

NATIONAL POLICY BOARD FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

FUNCTIONAL DOMAINS

These domains address the organizational processes and techniques by which the mission of the school is achieved. They provide for the educational program to be realized and allow the institution to function.

1. Leadership
2. Information Collection
3. Problems Analysis
4. Judgement
5. Organizational Oversight
6. Implementation
7. Delegation

PROGRAMMATIC DOMAINS

These domains focus on the scope and framework of the educational program. They reflect the core technology of schools, instruction, and the related supporting services, developmental activities, and resource base.

8. Instruction/the Learning Environment
9. Curriculum Design
10. Student Guidance and Development
11. Staff Development
12. Measurement and Evaluation
13. Resource Allocation

INTERPERSONAL DOMAINS

These domains recognize the significance of interpersonal connections in schools. They acknowledge the critical value of human relationships to the satisfaction of personal and professional goals, and to the achievement of organizational purpose.

14. Motivating Others
15. Interpersonal Sensitivity
16. Oral and Nonverbal Expression
17. Written Expression

CONTEXTUAL DOMAINS

These domains reflect the world of ideas and forces within which the school operates. They explore the intellectual, ethical, cultural, economic, political, and governmental influences upon schools, including traditional and emerging perspectives.

18. Philosophical and Cultural Values
19. Legal and Regulatory Applications
20. Policy and Political Influences
21. Public Relations

Two studies have been conducted for NASSP by Michigan State University--one completed in 1981 and the other in 1990--to determine if the assessment center is a valid predictor of successful job performance for principals. According to both studies, the answer is yes.

The 1990 study examined the preservice assessment center ratings and the subsequent job performance ratings of over 900 principals. Job performance was evaluated by the principal's supervisor and teachers working with that principal. The principal also completed a self-evaluation. It is interesting to note that principal self-evaluations tended to be very different from supervisor and teacher evaluations. As a result, the validity of assessment center ratings was examined using supervisor and teacher evaluations.

The study concluded that there is a correlation between high marks on assessment center activities and high job performance ratings. Therefore, principal candidates who receive high assessment center ratings are more likely to become outstanding principals than those who receive low ratings. (Schmitt, Cohen, 1990)

SUPPORT FOR REFORM IN TEXAS

The issue of the selection, development, and certification of school principals is on the agenda of two organizations in Texas--the Texas Business and Education Coalition (TBEC) and the Sid W. Richardson Foundation.

TBEC adopted a policy statement in May, 1994, calling for an overhaul of the current principal preparation process. The reformed system would include:

- Defining proficiencies for successful school leadership. The National Policy Board for Educational Administration's 21 domains and the State Board of Education administrator proficiencies would form the criteria for screening, training and certifying principals in Texas;

- Screening candidates for entry into a principal training program;

- Individualizing training programs based on identified needs, using an evaluation mechanism such as the NASSP Assessment Center;

- Providing a major portion of the training in a clinical, field-based setting instead of an academic setting;

- Granting a provisional certificate to candidates upon demonstrating mastery of the proficiencies and passing the ExCET test. During the period of provisional certification, the principals would be paired with a mentor;

- Granting full certification to principals that demonstrate school leadership. This would be based on school performance and local evaluations tied to the proficiencies;

- Establishing development requirements for continuing certification; and

- Evaluating principal preparation programs by looking at the entity's ability to develop principals that master the defined proficiencies and their subsequent success on the job.

The Sid W. Richardson Foundation sponsors a special forum to examine ways to improve teacher and administrator preparation. The forum participants include individuals from schools, education associations, business, government, universities and foundations. This group is developing recommendations for strengthening the principal selection, development and certification process.

While the final report from the Sid W. Richardson Foundation has not been issued, it is likely that the forum recommendations will call for a multi-level candidate selection process to enter a principal preparation program; a comprehensive assessment process to measure whether candidates possess the essential knowledge and skills identified by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration; a two-year internship with a carefully selected mentor principal; a two-tiered certification process that includes a provisional certificate and professional certification upon successful completion of the provisional period; and the creation of a separate professional educator standards board to evaluate and approve preparation programs and develop certification standards.

IMPROVEMENT INITIATIVES IN OTHER STATES

Many states are grappling with the issue of upgrading the preparation and certification, and on-going development of school principals. The following is an overview of a few noteworthy efforts.

In 1993, the **North Carolina** General Assembly enacted legislation to enhance the quality of educational leadership training programs by *reducing* the number of universities eligible to offer administrator degree-granting and certification programs from 12 to seven. Universities are required to apply for program approval. Applications are under review by a national panel of experts and programs will be selected and approved in November, 1994. In addition, a Principal Fellows Program was initiated to provide $20,000 annual scholarships to high-quality principal candidates to attend two-year preparation programs in exchange for four years of service as a school administrator in North Carolina. The Assembly also created an Administrator Standards Board. The board will establish standards for entering principals and superintendents, institute an assessment system to

measure whether principals and superintendents possess those prerequisite skills, and set on-going professional development requirements for practicing administrators. The Assembly will review a proposal during the 1995 session to fund a Leadership Institute at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill. All principals and superintendents would be required to cycle-through the Institute's administrator development program every five years to maintain a certificate.

Several states--**Missouri, South Carolina, Kentucky, Maryland**--require principal candidates or new principals to participate in the NASSP Assessment Center.

Missouri passed school reform legislation in 1987 that includes a requirement for principal candidates to successfully complete the NASSP Assessment Center process in order to be certified as a principal. Superintendents also must participate in a Missouri-developed assessment center to obtain a superintendent's certificate. The Missouri Department of Education administers the NASSP Assessment Center. Participants are charged a $495 fee. This covers assessment center costs but additional state funds are allocated for assessor training and stipends. The state department also directs a Leadership Institute. Through the Leadership Institute practicing principals and superintendents participate in periodic staff development activities.

Since the 1984 Education Improvement Act, **South Carolina** has required newly certified principals to be evaluated by a NASSP Assessment Center prior to taking a job as a principal. Assessment center results are shared with interviewing school districts. The diagnostic nature of the assessor team reports allow principals to use the performance feedback to fashion a targeted staff development plan. The assessment center is run by the South Carolina State Department of Education using outstanding practicing principals as assessors. The department also offers a variety of continuing development activities that are tied to enhancing the assessment center skill areas.

The 1990 **Kentucky** Education Reform Act requires principals to go through the NASSP Assessment Center to be eligible for employment. Results are given to employing districts and are public information. The law also requires superintendents to participate in a NASSP-like assessment process to be employed as a superintendent. NASSP and the American Association of School Administrators developed a Superintendent Leadership Development Program for Kentucky that started in 1993. Eleven key skills were identified as needed for success as a superintendent. The skill areas are encouraging innovation, planning and implementing strategic change, serving the needs of diverse constituencies, acquiring and interpreting key information, resisting premature judgements, resolving complex problems, communicating expectations, developing and empowering others, balancing complex demands, understanding personal strengths, and acquiring new learnings. As with the principal assessment center, simulation exercises and interviews are used to assess skill attainment. An evaluation by Michigan State University of assessment pilot efforts indicates that the leadership program should be a good measure

of a superintendent's professional ability. The Kentucky State Department of Education directs assessment center activities but satellite centers are located at five universities.

Maryland's State Board of Education mandates that all principal candidates take part in the NASSP Assessment Center process and receive ratings that are average or higher in each skill area in order to be certified as a principal. This certification requirement started in 1993. The Maryland Department of Education administers the assessment center. A $500 per person fee covers assessment center costs except for the salaries of state department personnel

TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT FOR TEACHERS

As states and school districts move forward with major restructuring plans to establish student performance standards and hold schools accountable for achievement results, calls for improved preparation and development of teachers are becoming more frequent. A recent publication by the National Governors' Association states that, "[i]ndeed, it is difficult to imagine how other educational reforms will succeed in the absence of an equally intensive effort to involve, support, and educate the educators themselves." This professional development effort, they contend, involves teacher acquisition of in-depth, subject-area knowledge, and new instructional approaches that teach students to reason, solve problems, apply knowledge, and communicate effectively, as well as collaboration skills that allow teachers to work effectively with colleagues, parents and the community in decentralized, site-managed schools. (National Governors' Association, 1994)

PREPARATION AND INITIAL CERTIFICATION

Preparation

There are 69 colleges and universities in Texas with approved teacher preparation programs. An additional 28 State Board of Education approved alternative teacher certification programs are run by Education Service Centers, local independent school districts, and universities.

According to the Texas Education Agency, teacher candidates completing alternative preparation programs have a greater tendency to stay in the teaching profession. Teacher retention was measured by looking at graduates who were employed as teachers six years after obtaining a certificate. In 1993-1994, 63 percent of the alternative program graduates were still teaching and only 56 percent of those completing traditional, university-based programs continued to be employed as teachers.

In addition to the traditional university-based and alternative educator preparation programs, the Legislature, in 1991, created and funded Centers for Professional Development and Technology. The centers are collaborative initiatives between universities, Education Service Centers, school districts and local businesses. They are located on campuses of participating school districts and designed to provide intensive, field-based preparation programs for prospective teachers. The center campuses also become demonstration sites on how to effectively integrate technology and innovative teaching practices into classrooms. The centers, while focusing on upgrading teacher preservice programs, are charged also with providing on-going staff development activities for practicing teachers.

The centers receive special funding through the Texas Education Agency, Rider 18, in the Appropriations Act. Center funding was $13.2 million for the 1992-1993 biennium, $12.2

million in 1994 and $9.3 million in 1995. Eight centers were started in 1993 with six added in 1994. The State Board of Education approved funding to establish three new centers for 1995.

Universities interested in establishing centers applied for funding on a competitive, application basis. It was envisioned by the Commissioner of Education that state funds be seed money to get the centers up and running. The universities are expected to institutionalize the centers to be supported, after three years, with general operating funds.

Professional development schools, such as the Centers for Professional Development and Technology have been advocated by a number of education organizations. In a recent publication of the Education Commission of the States promoting simultaneous renewal of teacher education programs and public schools, the concept of clinical or professional development schools is embraced. ..."[W]here professional development schools are operating, the clinical sites have become key inservice centers for experienced and beginning teachers, as well as a critical component of the preservice preparation programs. They should be seen as a key component of a comprehensive teacher education program." (Frazier, 1993, p. 22)

Certification

Applicants for a teaching certificate are required by law to have a degree in an academic major or an interdisciplinary academic major. Undergraduate education degrees are no longer granted since 1991.

State Board of Education rules outline specific requirements for a variety of certificates. These certificates include the teacher of young children, elementary, junior high school, high school, special education, vocational education, special subjects (such as art, health, physical education), and special service positions (such as counselor, reading specialist, supervisor).

The final step in the certification process is passing the ExCET tests required for teachers. This includes passing either a elementary or secondary professional development (pedagogy) test and appropriate content specialization (biology, history) and professional (counselor, supervisor) tests. There are currently 60 content specialization and professional tests.

CONTINUING CERTIFICATION AND DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS

Texas issues a permanent or lifetime teaching certificate for teachers as they do for administrators. Texas is one of nine states that issue certificates to teachers for life. Over half of the states require teachers to renew certificates or licenses every three to five years. Renewal requirements often include teaching experience, additional university course

hours or degrees, and hours of approved professional development activities. (National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, 1994-1995)

While teacher staff development requirements in Texas are not tied to certificate or license renewal, state law mandates three days of inservice training each year. The relevance of staff development activities to individual classroom teachers is an often debated subject. According to survey results published in a recent issue of the Journal of Staff Development, the answers are not too promising.

Five hundred randomly selected Texas teachers were surveyed in 1991 about their attitudes toward teacher inservice. The 275 teachers responding indicated that while they believed staff development could improve classroom teaching, 53 percent of respondents thought inservice activities were *not* relevant to their teaching needs. In fact, only 38 percent felt that inservice training applied to their classroom teaching.

One explanation provided by the survey for this attitude among respondents is that teachers seem to be left out of the loop in planning and evaluating inservice activities. Only 32 percent of those surveyed said that teachers were involved in developing and evaluating inservice programs.

Of great concern to those surveyed was the lack of after-the-fact support teachers received to implement techniques learned during staff development activities. Almost 42 percent indicated that more support was needed, and only 25 percent indicated that assistance and materials are actually provided by their schools or district. Additionally, 60 percent said that staff development activities *were not* evaluated by the administration to see if they were successful. (McBride, Reed, Dollar, 1994)

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION AND TEXAS EDUCATION AGENCY IMPROVEMENT EFFORTS

As they did with school administrators, the State Board of Education adopted proficiencies for teachers. These are the skills and knowledge that all Texas teachers should possess. The state adopted teacher proficiencies are:

- The teacher possesses and draws on a rich knowledge base of content, pedagogy, and technology to provide relevant and meaningful learning experiences for all students.

- To create a learner-centered community, the teacher collaboratively identifies needs; and plans, implements, and assesses instruction using technology and other resources.

- The teacher responds appropriately to diverse groups of learners.

- While acting as an advocate for all students and the school, the teacher demonstrates effective professional and interpersonal communication skills.

- The teacher, as a reflective practitioner dedicated to all students' success demonstrates a commitment to learn, to improve the profession, and to maintain professional ethics and personal integrity. (Texas Education Agency, 1994)

These teacher proficiencies will guide all revisions to teacher ExCET tests and the development of a new appraisal system for practicing Texas teachers.

The new appraisal system will replace the often-criticized Texas Teacher Appraisal System (TTAS). The Texas Education Agency is contracting for the development of the system, to assess the performance of beginning and experienced teachers. The contract is scheduled to begin October 1, 1994 at a cost not to exceed $300,000 for the initial phase of the project. Funding for phase two (September, 1995 - August, 1997) activities depends on the availability of resources. While the TTAS is based on a one-shot observation of classroom teaching, this system is likely to include multiple assessment activities, such as a portfolio of teaching practice that includes classroom videotapes, student work, lesson plans, as well as assessment center exercises away from the classroom, such as interviews and classroom simulation activities. However, the system is not anticipated to be in place until the 1997-1998 school year.

Another major effort was launched last year to upgrade the state's educator preparation programs. The product is the Educator Excellence Indicator System (EEIS). The system will measure whether educator preparation programs--university-based or alternative programs--are producing teachers and administrators who can demonstrate the adopted proficiencies. The performance of teacher and administrator candidates on the EEIS indicators will be used to judge the quality of the preparation programs. Preparation programs will be held accountable for the performance of exiting students. Only those programs meeting EEIS standards will be accredited.

The Commission on Standards for the Teaching Profession--an advisory group of university professors, teachers and administrators--has spent the year developing the EEIS and presented their recommended system to the State Board of Education in October. The Commission proposes two accreditation indicators--performance on the ExCET tests and subsequent classroom performance measured by the new appraisal system for teachers. Standards for performance on the ExCET test will be adopted and implemented in 1994-1995. Since the new teacher appraisal system is being developed, those performance standards will not be set until 1997-1998.

NATIONAL IMPROVEMENT EFFORTS

A great deal of work is being done at the national level to identify proficiencies, or standards, for beginning and experienced teachers.

The most ambitious initiative is the certification system being developed by the **National Board for Professional Teaching Standards**. The Board's system will provide for voluntary national certification of experienced teachers. Teachers are eligible for National Board certification if they have a baccalaureate degree from an accredited institution and have completed at least three years of teaching. Over 30 certificates will be offered based on the subject taught and the age of students being taught. (See table on next page) The assessment process involves compiling a school site portfolio to include classroom videotapes, student work, lesson plans and reflective essays written by the teacher. Additionally, the teacher attends an assessment center for one to two days to participate in exercises such as evaluating other teachers, subject matter exams, and structured interviews.

The assessments for the first two certificate areas--early adolescence/English language arts and early adolescence/generalist--were field tested during the 1993-1994 school year and will be offered in 1994-1995. At the end of five years, all certificates will be available or under development.

The National Board was established in 1987 as a result of a recommendation from the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession report, "A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century." The Board is governed by a 63-member board. The majority of the board members are practicing teachers. It is funded through gifts and grants, and has received $20 million in federal matching funds for research and development since 1991.

Board certification is being viewed as a vehicle for improving teaching in a variety of ways. The Board's standards and assessment process can guide the staff development activities of individual teachers preparing for National Board certification. This can impact course and professional development offerings at university teacher education programs. The certification process will identify and publicly recognize the most accomplished teachers. These teachers can then take on new leadership roles in schools.

Some states are adopting policies to reward and encourage teachers to participate in National Board certification once it becomes available. The North Carolina legislature recently passed a bill that provides state funding of the National Board certification fee ($975) for participating teachers, allows for up to three release days for candidates to complete certification activities, and gives a 4% annual salary increase to Board certified teachers. The New Mexico legislature provided $400,000 to assist teachers to become Board certified. They also directed the New Mexico State Board of Education to allow National Board certified teachers to be eligible for the highest professional teaching

FRAMEWORK OF NATIONAL BOARD CERTIFICATES

Early Childhood (Ages 3 - 8)
Generalist

Middle Childhood (Ages 7 - 12)
Generalist
English Language Arts
Mathematics
Science
Social Studies-History

Early and Middle Childhood (Ages 3 - 12)
Art
Exceptional Needs/Generalist
Foreign Language - Spanish, French and others
Guidance Counseling
Library/Media
Music
Physical Education
English as a New Language

Early Adolescence (Ages 11 - 15)
Generalist
English Language Arts
Mathematics
Science
Social Studies-History

Adolescence and Young Adulthood (Ages 14 - 18+)
English Language Arts
Mathematics
Science
Social Studies-History

Early Adolescence through Young Adulthood (Ages 11 - 18+)
Art
Exceptional Needs/Generalist
Foreign Language - Spanish, French and others
Guidance Counseling
Health
Library/Media
Music
Physical Education
English as a New Language
Vocational Education - agriculture, business, health occupations, home economics, industry/technology and marketing

licensure. The Mississippi legislature has approved a $3,000 salary supplement for teachers achieving National Board certification.

A parallel national initiative is the **Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium** (INTASC). This program, directed by the Council of Chief State School Officers, is developing model standards and assessments for licensing new teachers. Texas is one of 17 states represented on the INTASC Task Force on Teacher Licensing. However, INTASC is not as far along in the development process as the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. While they have identified a common core of knowledge and skills for beginning teachers, the specific standards for subjects areas and different levels of schooling have not been generated. The INTASC standards and certificate fields should be compatible with the National Board. It is interesting to note, however, that INTASC has concluded that beginning teachers must possess the same knowledge, skills, understanding and commitment as experienced teachers. The difference is "in the degree of sophistication teachers exhibit in the application of knowledge rather than in the kind of knowledge needed." (INTASC, 1992, page 7)

The Educational Testing Service (ETS) has developed a product--**Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments**--that measures the performance of teachers in the beginning years of teaching. It was developed to be used by states to make teacher licensing decisions and by school districts to provide diagnostic information to teachers on skill deficiencies. ETS identified a common core of knowledge and skills necessary to be an effective beginning teacher. These are organized around four domains--Organizing Content Knowledge for Student Learning, Creating an Environment for Student Learning, Teaching for Student Learning, and Teacher Professionalism. The knowledge and skills base for beginning teachers was developed by conducting a job analysis survey of almost 3,000 educators and community representatives, reviewing studies in the field, and analyzing current teacher evaluations. Pilot tests of the assessment process and evaluator training were conducted in Minnesota and Delaware in 1991. The system assesses teachers using three methods--classroom observation, review of teacher-prepared documents, and semi-structured interviews. Effective teaching with culturally diverse students is a major focus of the assessment process. The system includes an intensive training program for assessors. Praxis III is being piloted in Ohio during the 1994-1995 school year to determine the capability of the system to assess teachers based the state's new performance standards for beginning teachers.

One element that seems to be missing in the planning and development of teacher assessment systems at the national and state levels is how the teacher's skill to enable his or her students to meet achievement standards can play a role in assessing teachers. This point is emphasized by an Education Commission of the States publication on linking teacher education and school reform.

> It is important that teacher licensing have some relationship to the demonstrated ability of the teacher to help students meet established learning standards. In the past, states, through their agencies, have stressed the need for certificated teachers to have demonstrated competence in such areas as classroom management, use of a variety of teaching strategies and communication skills. With the adoption of state standards for students, states now can relate teacher performance to student performance in a way that has not been possible in the past. (Frazier, 1993, page 14)

IMPROVEMENT INITIATIVES IN OTHER STATES

Most states are altering their current programs of educator preparation and development. In addition, states have looked at options for financing on-going staff development activities for practicing teachers. The following are a few interesting initiatives.

A number of states have moved toward creating independent boards to govern the teaching profession. One-third of states now have professional standards boards and nine of those are independent of the state's board of education. The **Minnesota** Board of Teaching will complete the implementation of a comprehensive teacher preparation and licensing system in 1995. Teacher preparation will take place primarily on K - 12 campuses and include a one-year supervised internship in a professional development school. (Recruiting Teachers Inc. and National Conference of State Legislatures, 1993)

Kentucky is developing a comprehensive performance-based teacher licensing system. New teacher performance standards have been identified. Assessments of the standards by specialty areas of licensure are being developed. Assessments will include a longitudinal look at classroom performance and portfolio tasks. Plans are to develop independent professional development plans for teachers and establish school-based clinical training sites. The Kentucky Education Professional Standards Board also is creating an accountability index to be used to approve teacher training programs. (Goddu, 1994)

The push for additional staff development to retool our existing cadre of teachers has prompted state action on financing local staff development programs. Some might view the actions as a "shell game" since the financing has come from dedicating existing school resources. **Minnesota and Missouri** have targeted two percent of school revenue to staff training and development. (Odden, 1994) **Florida** requires local school districts to fund school staff development with at least 2.5 percent of their budgets. (Recruiting Teachers Inc. and National Conference of State Legislatures, 1993)

LINKING STAFF DEVELOPMENT TO IMPROVED STUDENT LEARNING

Two major public school improvement programs were initiated in 1991 by Texas Commissioner of Education Lionel Meno. The Partnership Schools Initiative and the Texas Middle School Network have promoted staff development as a key element in the restructuring of schools.

The **Partnership Schools Initiative** is focused on improving overall student achievement and closing the performance gap between students of differing ethnic and economic groups. To do this, the partnership schools are charged with restructuring their education programs. This is done by providing intensive staff development activities that are planned by the teachers and tailored to the specific needs of the students. Through the Commissioner's waiver authority, the schools are given up to 15 additional staff development days in lieu of student instructional days to accomplish their goals. The Commissioner expects these schools to become successful models for restructuring that can be replicated throughout the state.

The PSI programs have been in place since the 1992-1993 school year. With two full years under the belt, what has happened to student performance in 98 participating schools? Comparing the TAAS scores (percent passing all tests) in 1993 and 1994 for students in grades four, eight and ten in the PSI schools with the performance of students statewide, students in PSI schools *improved* at a greater rate at grades four and eight but not at grade ten. The greater rate of improvement for students in PSI schools also holds true when TAAS results are disaggregated by ethnic groups--African American and Hispanic--and for economically disadvantaged students. (See table next page)

However, a rigorous, formal evaluation is needed to determine whether the improvement at grades four and eight can be attributed to the staff development activities and additional training days granted these schools. Other factors, such as a change in principal at the school, could have had a greater impact on achievement levels than staff training and development.

The **Middle School Network** agenda is to restructure middle schools based on the vision of middle school education adopted by the State Board of Education. Over 800 of the state's 1,100 middle schools participate in the network and each is assigned to one of 56 mentor schools. The mentor schools provide guidance and assistance to network schools as they restructure their middle school programs. That assistance involves providing staff development activities and opportunities for peer collaboration.

In 1993, the Texas Education Agency contracted with a professor at the University of Houston-Clear Lake to conduct a study to determine to what extent the middle school reforms adopted by the State Board of Education have been implemented in Texas middle schools. The study also would evaluate the effectiveness of the Middle School Network

COMPARISON OF 1993 AND 1994 TAAS RESULTS AT GRADES 4, 8, AND 10 STUDENTS IN PARTNERSHIP SCHOOLS AND STUDENTS STATEWIDE

	Partnership Schools 1993	Partnership Schools 1994	Percent Increase	Students Statewide 1993	Students Statewide 1994	Percent Increase
Grade 4 - % Passing:						
All Tests, All Students	40	54	14	47	55	8
All Tests, African American	21	33	12	26	34	8
All Tests, Hispanic	32	46	14	32	44	12
All Tests, Economic Disadvant.	28	44	16	31	41	10
Grade 8 - % Passing:						
All Tests, All Students	43	52	9	46	51	5
All Tests, African American	26	33	7	23	27	4
All Tests, Hispanic	30	39	9	28	34	6
All Tests, Economic Disadvant.	28	36	8	26	31	5
Grade 10 - % Passing						
All Tests, All Students	42	42	0	52	54	2
All Tests, African American	31	26	-5	29	30	1
All Tests, Hispanic	30	28	-2	35	36	1
All Tests, Economic Disadvant.	27	28	1	32	34	2

in disseminating information and providing staff training on best practices in middle schools. A total of 911 schools participated in the study. While the study found that about half of the schools were partially or fully implementing reform practices and that a great deal of staff development had taken place, there appeared to be little relationship between those activities and improved student achievement. This study, however, took place during the first full year after the Middle School Network was set up. (Rakow, 1994)

While the school districts that participated in the Legislative Budget Board/Educational Economic Policy Center survey of school district spending on staff development were not chosen for the survey because of participation in a special program focused on providing more opportunities or days for staff development, the districts did, as a group, increase spending on staff development from 1991 to 1993. An analysis was conducted to see if there was any relationship between spending changes from 1991 to 1993 and changes in TAAS scores. The "change" in TAAS scores was measured as the difference in the percentage of students passing all tests taken at grades four, eight and 10 between 1993 and 1994. The analysis--at the district and campus levels--found no correlation between changes in spending and TAAS scores.

HIGHER EDUCATION'S ROLE IN THE PREPARATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATORS

Higher education has been and continues to be the training ground for most of the nation's teachers and administrators. While 41 states have adopted alternative routes for certification, as Texas has, only two percent of recently-hired teachers nationwide report that they followed an alternative preparation route. (Recruiting Teachers Inc. and National Conference of State Legislatures, 1993) However, there is growing frustration on the part of legislators and other education policymakers about higher education's unwillingness to improve teacher and administrator preparation and provide quality development programs for the existing educator workforce. Many believe that higher education has not played an effective part in states' efforts to improve K - 12 education.

> Our conversation indicated that many legislators and state education leaders do not believe higher education is playing a constructive role regarding teacher development. Three prevalent concerns are that colleges and universities: a) are doing a poor job of preparing teachers; b) are weak on follow-up mentoring and support; and c) fail to connect their teaching and research with school and state-level concerns (or at least fail to communicate their research in accessible forms). (Recruiting Teachers Inc. and National Conference of State Legislatures, 1993, page 25)

> Higher education must be brought into the reform loop. Public schools struggling with restructuring cannot be handicapped each year with the arrival of thousands of new teachers unprepared to respond to public demand for change. Simultaneous reform--public schools and teacher education working together--must be the focus. (Frazier, 1993, page 1)

Despite the acknowledged failings of universities to adequately prepare teachers and administrators and upgrade skills of the current educators, higher education still is viewed as a resource that must be tapped--either by incentives or mandates.

Professional development schools are viewed by many as the vehicle to bring together higher education faculty and public school educators to work collaboratively to improve the initial preparation and on-going development of educators and test new and innovative programs for public school students.

Texas is leading among states in providing special funding to establish professional development schools. And despite the state's investment of over $34 million during the last three years, staff at the Texas Education Agency and the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board express concerns about whether the participating universities are committed to continuing the centers and expanding the field-based preparation of prospective teachers when the state's earmarked funds are no longer available. The

universities' colleges of education maintain that they don't get their fair share of institutional operating funds and that university administrators don't acknowledge faculty participation in public school programs when making promotion and tenure decisions.

A program in **Michigan**--The Michigan Partnership for New Education--has gained national attention as a model public school, higher education, and business partnership. The partnership, as a public-private non-profit group, will raise $48 million over five years to fund public schools that will experiment with innovative teaching programs, an Education Leadership Academy and an Institute for Restructuring Professional Education. (Recruiting Teachers Inc. and National Conference of State Legislatures, 1993)

Early this year, the Chancellor of The University of Texas System appointed a task force to make recommendations on how the U.T. System should improve and expand its programs with the public schools. The recommendations included implementing Centers for Professional Development and Technology systemwide, establishing Educational Leadership Institutes for superintendents, principals, teachers, and other instructional leaders, and reviewing tenure and promotion policies to provide incentives to university faculty to participate in collaborative projects with public schools. (Task Force on U.T. System/Public School Collaboration, 1994)

In an effort to force university teacher education programs to be accountable for the product they produce, a few states mandate follow-up assistance to beginning teachers when classroom performance falls below expectations. One state--**Hawaii**--has a teacher warranty program that allows poor performing teachers who are graduates of the University of Hawaii to receive follow-up services. In **Oregon**, two universities offer warranty programs to teachers prepared by those schools and to their employing school districts. (National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, 1994-1995)

CONCLUSIONS

There is evidence that suggests that staff development can play a positive role in states' efforts to improve student learning in public schools.

Certainly, more can and must be done to improve the initial preparation of teachers. More attention must be paid to upgrading the training of the key leaders in our schools, the principals. In both instances, the preparation must focus on providing additional opportunities to learn and practice the trade in the schools. Applying the theory absorbed in university classrooms to real-life situations is critical. In Texas, the Centers for Professional Development and Technology have been charged with providing a hands-on preparation experience. While the Centers are in the early stages of implementing programs, the plans are on target.

However, it is just as critical for the state to make sure the teachers and administrators, primarily principals, possess the skills and knowledge necessary to be effective educators and leaders *before* they are certified. The current screening process for teacher candidates, the pedagogy and subject matter ExCET tests, may be adequate for certification, but must be followed immediately with appropriate evaluations of performance once the teacher is in the classroom. The current certification requirements for principals are clearly inadequate and a rigorous assessment of essential skills must be adopted.

But that shouldn't be the last stop in the certification process. Renewal of the initial certificate--probably within the first three to five years--allows the state to reassess educators based on job performance. By providing incentives for advanced certification, either through the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards or systems adopted by the state, the state encourages a higher level of professionalism among educators.

The point made by Calvin Frazier in the Education Commission of the States' publication about linking teacher performance to student performance merits serious consideration. As Texas completes implementation of the state's school accountability system, thought should be given to how student achievement and the role a teacher plays in the learning process can be used in a system of appraisal and periodic recertification.

Staff development for the current cadre of educators must be linked to the specific needs of the educator identified by an evaluation or assessment process. The NASSP Assessment Center, or NASSP's Leadership Early Assessment Program can diagnose the skill development needs of principals. A similar assessment process for teachers needs to be in place quickly.

The Commissioner of Education, Lionel Meno, has proposed that 20 staff development days be added annually to the three days currently required. Since we don't have teacher and principal assessment systems in place, this would appear to be putting the cart before

the horse. Also, reports from teachers that most inservice activities are irrelevant and poorly planned should call into question the wisdom of mandating a whole lot more of the same. Results from the Legislative Budget Board/Educational Economic Policy Center school district survey show total spending on staff development to be almost $110 million in 1993. The Texas Education Agency estimates that adding five staff development days in 1996 and another five in 1997 will cost almost $1 *billion*. It is hard to justify the cost given the uncertainty about the quality and effectiveness of existing staff development programs.

The current process that allows the Commissioner to grant waivers to schools and districts for additional staff development days in lieu of instructional days has a positive side. The brief waiver application requires schools to explain the purpose of the staff development and show evidence that teachers have been involved in planning and developing staff training activities. This process should continue until assessment systems are in place to diagnose the specific staff development needs of principals and teachers.

RESOURCES

Education Commission of the States, (1992) The Allocation of Money and Its Impact on Education Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Erlandson, David A., (1994) Building a Career: Fulfilling the Lifetime Professional Needs of Principals Fairfax, VA: National Policy Board for Educational Administration.

Frazier, Calvin M., (1993) A Shared Vision: Policy Recommendations for Linking Teacher Education to School Reform Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Goddu, Roland, (1994) "Kentucky's New Preparation and Licensing System" *Quality Teaching* 3(3) 4-5, Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium, (1992) Model Standards for Beginning Teacher Licensing and Development: A Resource for State Dialogue Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.

McBride, R.E., Reed, J.L., Dollar, J.E., (1994) "Teacher Attitudes Toward Staff Development: A Symbolic Relationship at Best" *Journal of Staff Development* 15(2), 36-41.

National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (1994-1995) Manual on Certification and Preparation of Educational Personnel in the United States Second Edition, Seattle, WA: National Assocation of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certifcation.

National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, Q & A Detroit, MI: National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

National Commission for the Principalship, (1990) Principals for Our Changing Schools Fairfax, VA: National Commission for the Principalship.

National Governors' Association, (1994) Professional Development for Educators A Priority for Reaching High Standards Washington, DC: National Governors' Association.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration, (1993) Principals for Our Changing Schools The Knowledge and Skill Base Fairfax, VA: National Policy Board for Educational Administration.

Odden, Allan, (1994) "Including School Finance in Systemic Reform Strategies: A Commentary" *CPRE Finance Briefs* FB-04-5/94, Madison, WI: Consortium for Policy Research in Education Finance Center.

Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U. S. Department of Education, (1994) "Professional Development, Standards, and Education Reform" *OERI Bulletin*, Winter, 1994, U. S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Praskac, A. and Powell, R. (1993) A First Look at Site-Based Decision Making in Texas Public Schools Austin, TX: Texas Center for Educational Research.

Rakow, Steven J., (1994) Survey of Middle School Practices Executive Summary Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency.

Recruiting New Teachers, Inc., and National Conference of State Legislatures, (1993) State Policies to Improve the Teacher Workforce Shaping the Profession that Shapes American's Future Belmont, MA: Recruiting New Teachers, Inc.

Richardson, Joanna, (1994) "Professional Development Advocated as a Linchpin" *Education Week*, 13(34), 8.

Sashkin, M. and Egermeier, J., (1993) School Change Models and Processes A Review and Synthesis of Research and Practice U. S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Programs for the Improvement of Practice.

Schmitt, N. and Cohen, S.A., (1990) Criterion-Related and Content Validity of the NASSP Assessment Center Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Silhanek, Beth, (1991) An Examination of Certification and Professional Development of Superintendents and Principals Across the Fifty States A Report of Findings Iowa State University.

Sparks, D. and Loucks-Horsley, S., (1990) Five Models of Staff Development for Teachers Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.

Task Force on U.T. System/Public School Collaboration, (1994) Report on Proposed Initiatives Austin, TX: The University of Texas System.

Texas Education Agency, (1994) Learner-Centered Schools for Texas A Vision of Texas Educators Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency.

Witters-Churchill, Laurie (1990) Performance-Based Preparation of Principals: The Texas Study University Council for Educational Administration Monograph Series, The Principalship in the 1990s and Beyond: Current Research on Performance-Based Preparation and Professional Development, Tempe, AZ: The University Council for Educational Administration.

ATTACHMENT 1
SCHOOL DISTRICTS PARTICIPATING IN STAFF DEVELOPMENT SURVEY

OVER 25,000 ENROLLMENT

Houston Independent School District

Dallas Independent School District

Fort Worth Independent School District

Austin Independent School District

El Paso Independent School District

San Antonio Independent School District

Ysleta Independent School District*

Arlington Independent School District

Cypress-Fairbanks Independent School District

Aldine Independent School District

North East Independent School District

Corpus Christi Independent School District

Fort Bend Independent School District

Garland Independent School District

Pasadena Independent School District*

Richardson Independent School District

Plano Independent School District

Amarillo Independent School District

Ector County Independent School District

*these districts provided program information only

Klein Independent School District

Spring Branch Independent School District

Mesquite Independent School District

Conroe Independent School District

10,000 TO 24,999 ENROLLMENT

Irving Independent School District

Midland Independent School District

Hurst-Euless-Bedford Independent School District

Socorro Independent School District

Harlingen Consolidated Independent School District

Waco Independent School District

Harlandale Independent School District

Port Arthur Independent School District

Eagle Pass Independent School District

5,000 TO 9,999 ENROLLMENT

Lufkin Independent School District

La Porte Independent School District

Huntsville Independent School District

Eanes Independent School District

Granbury Independent School District

Del Valle Independent School District

3,000 TO 4,999 ENROLLMENT

Highland Park Independent School District

Ennis Independent School District

Levelland Independent School District

Terrell Independent School District

Frenship Independent School District

Dumas Independent School District

Castleberry Independent School District

Eagle Mt-Saginaw Independent School District

1,600 TO 2,999 ENROLLMENT

Mabank Independent School District

Fabens Independent School District

Sweeny Independent School District

Center Independent School District

Huffman Independent School District

Medina Valley Independent School District

Bowie Independent School District

1,000 TO 1,599 ENROLLMENT

Valley View Independent School District

Lake Worth Independent School District

Glen Rose Independent School District

George West Independent School District

500 TO 999 ENROLLMENT

Stanton Independent School District

Culberson County Independent School District

Quanah Independent School District

Hawley Independent School District

Memphis Independent School District

Lago Vista Independent School District

UNDER 500 ENROLLMENT

Gruver Independent School District

Lovejoy Independent School District

Rankin Independent School District

Gunter Independent School District

Jonesboro Independent School District

Bryson Independent School District

Morgan Independent School District

Spring Creek Independent School District

ATTACHMENT 2
SURVEY OF SCHOOL DISTRICT STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS FOR PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS AND INSTRUCTIONAL RELATED PERSONNEL

The Legislative Budget Board and the Educational Economic Policy Center are conducting a study of school district and campus staff development programs. What the state can do to support and strengthen school staff training will be a major focus of the study. As part of the study, we would like to provide baseline data on school district spending on staff development for principals, teachers, and instructional related personnel for the last three years. Bulletin 679 focuses on spending for instructional staff development for instructional staff only. We have expanded the Bulletin 679 definition in order to provide a more comprehensive look at expenditures for all staff development activities for instructional staff, including principals.

If you have any questions about the use of the data or the information, please call Nancy Frank at 512/305-9578, or David Dunn at 512/305-9579.

> Definition: Spending which is exclusively for in-service training and other staff development involving principals, teachers and instructional related personnel of the district. Costs are for delivering training to principals, teachers and instructional related staff, and **do include portions of salaries of regular or contract staff who spend part of their work time conducting staff development.** Examples of staff development costs are travel and subsistence for personnel involved in in-service or staff development events, fees for outside consultants or specialists conducting in-service or staff development, salaries or portions of salaries of personnel involved with in-service or staff development, amounts paid to regional education service centers for in-service and staff development, etc. These staff development costs include expenditures for instructional **and noninstructional** in-service and staff development for principals, teachers and instructional related staff.

1. How much did your school district spend during the 1992-1993 school year on staff development involving principals, teachers and instructional related personnel of the district? (remember that this includes portions of salaries of district personnel conducting staff development and noninstructional in-service and staff development)

District Expenditures:

	STATE/LEA FUNDS	FEDERAL FUNDS	TOTAL
PRINCIPALS			
TEACHERS			
OTHER INSTRUCT			
TOTAL			

2. How much did your school district spend during the 1991-1992 school year on staff development involving principals, teachers and instructional related personnel of the district? (remember that this includes portions of salaries of district personnel conducting staff development and noninstructional in-service and staff development)

District Expenditures:

	STATE/LEA FUNDS	FEDERAL FUNDS	TOTAL
PRINCIPALS			
TEACHERS			
OTHER INSTRUCT			
TOTAL			

3. How much did your school district spend during the 1990-1991 school year on staff development involving principals, teachers and instructional related personnel of the district? (remember that this includes portions of salaries of district personnel conducting staff development and noninstructional in-service and staff development)

District Expenditures:

	STATE/LEA FUNDS	FEDERAL FUNDS	TOTAL
PRINCIPALS			
TEACHERS			
OTHER INSTRUCT			
TOTAL			

4. How much did your district spend during the last three years on staff development for all other district personnel (other than principals, teachers and instructional related personnel)?

District Expenditures:

	1990-1991	1991-1992	1992-1993
ALL OTHER PERSONNEL			

5. How much did your school district spend during the past three years on staff development involving principals, teachers and instructional related personnel by campus? (Make additional copies of this sheet if you have more than 4 campuses in your district)

Spending by Campus:

Campus Name_____

	1990-1991	1991-1992	1992-1993
PRINCIPAL(S)			
TEACHERS			
OTHER INSTRUCT			
TOTAL			

Campus Name_____

	1990-1991	1991-1992	1992-1993
PRINCIPAL(S)			
TEACHERS			
OTHER INSTRUCT			
TOTAL			

Campus Name_____

	1990-1991	1991-1992	1992-1993
PRINCIPAL(S)			
TEACHERS			
OTHER INSTRUCT			
TOTAL			

Campus Name_____

	1990-1991	1991-1992	1992-1993
PRINCIPAL(S)			
TEACHERS			
OTHER INSTRUCT			
TOTAL			

REFERS TO STAFF DEVELOPMENT FOR PRINCIPALS, TEACHERS AND INSTRUCTIONAL RELATED PERSONNEL

6. What is the main way that your district decides how much to spend each year on staff development?
   a. A percent of total budget
   b. Requests from campuses
   c. Personnel or program deficiencies identified by central administration
   d. Other (explain)_____

7. Does your district allocate staff development money to campuses?
   a. Yes
   b. No
   c. Other (explain)_____

7A. If yes, how is the campus allocation determined?
   a. Every campus gets the same amount.
   b. Per pupil allocation.
   c. Per staff allocation.
   d. By campus request.
   e. Low-performing campuses get more money.
   f. Campuses with more at-risk students get more money.
   g. Other (explain)_____

8. Who primarily determines **how much** each campus in your district spends on staff development each year?
   a. School board
   b. Superintendent
   c. District-level committee
   d. Principals
   e. Campus-level committees
   f. Other (specify)_____

9. Who primarily decides **how** staff development funds are spent at each campus in your district?
   a. School board
   b. Superintendent
   c. District-level committee
   d. Principals
   e. Campus-level committees
   f. Subject or grade-level teachers
   g. Individual teachers
   h. Other (specify)_____

10. How does your district evaluate the effectiveness of its staff development program?

a. Survey participants for "customer" satisfaction
b. Look at personnel evaluations of participants to see if they're doing a better job
c. The bottom line is improved student performance
d. The district doesn't evaluate the effectiveness of its program
e. Other (explain)_____

11. Does your district provide follow-up after staff training?

a. Yes
b. No

11A. If yes, what kind of follow-up do you provide?

_____
_____
_____
_____

12. Of the total time spent in your district on principal, teacher and instructional related staff development, what percentage of the training is delivered by the following entities or people: (check appropriate box)

	1- 25%	26 - 50%	51 - 75%	76 - 100%
Educ.Serv.Centers				
Prof.Educ.Orgs.				
District Staff				
Private Sector				
University Faculty				
Master Teachers				
Other (identify) _____				

13. Who primarily selects providers of staff training?

a. School board
b. Superintendent
c. Other central office personnel (identify)_____
d. District-level committee
e. Principals
f. Campus-level committees
g. Teachers
h. Other (specify)_____

REFERS TO STAFF DEVELOPMENT FOR PRINCIPALS ONLY

14. Who primarily determines how much your district spends on principal staff development each year?

a. School board
b. Superintendent
c. District-level committee
d. Principals
e. Campus-level committees
f. Other (specify)_____

15. Who primarily determines the staff development activities for principals in your district?

a. Superintendent
b. Other central office personnel (identify)_____
c. District-level committee
d. Principals
e. Campus-level committees
f. Teachers
g. Other (specify)_____

16. What criteria are used to determine principal staff development activities in your district ? (May choose one or more)

a. campus academic performance
b. personnel evaluations
c. personnel interest
d. district goals
e. Federal/state directives and/or programs
f. other (specify)_____

17. How are principals chosen to participate in training programs in your district? (May choose one or more)

a. Principals choose
b. All principals required to participate
c. Only principals of low-performing schools are required to participate
d. New principals are required to participate
e. Other (explain)_____

18. What percentage of time spent training principals in your school district is focused on the following: (check appropriate box)

	1- 25%	26 - 50%	51 - 75%	76 - 100%
Leadership/ "visioning"				
Measurement and evaluation				
Public relations/ community support				
Instruction/ curriculum design				
School safety/ discipline management				
Organizational management				
Interpersonal skills				

REFERS TO STAFF DEVELOPMENT FOR TEACHERS ONLY

19. Who primarily determines how much your district spends on staff development for teachers and instructional related personnel each year?

a. School board
b. Superintendent
c. District-level committee
d. Principals
e. Campus-level committees
f. Teachers
g. Other (specify)_____

20. Who primarily determines the staff development activities for teachers and other instructional personnel in your district?

a. Superintendent
b. Other central office personnel (identify)_____
c. District-level committee
d. Principals
e. Campus-level committees
f. Teachers
g. Other (specify)_____

21. What criteria are used to determine staff development activities for teachers and instructional related personnel in your district ? (May choose one or more)

a. student academic performance
b. personnel evaluations
c. personnel interest
d. district goals
e. Federal/state directives and/or programs
f. other (specify)_____

22. Are teachers and instructional related personnel in your district required to attend districtwide staff development activities?

a. Yes
b. No

22A. If yes, list examples of activities.

_____
_____
_____

23. What percentage of time spent training teachers and instructional related personnel in your school district is focused on the following: (check appropriate box)

	1- 25%	26 - 50%	51 - 75%	76 - 100%
Instructional strategies				
Curriculum design				
Technology				
Student learning styles				
Cultural values				
Measurement and evaluation				
District rules and policies				
Non-academics, such as CPR, AIDS and drug awareness training				
School staffing, budgeting and organization				